

**Greenville Intermodal
Transportation Center
Greenville, North Carolina**
MMPA Project No. 07124.00



**MOSER
MAYER
PHOENIX**
ASSOCIATES, PA

Team Visits Meeting Summaries – July 16 and 17, 2007

Meeting 1: Steering Committee

Attendees:

Graham James	Martin Alexiou Bryson
Thom Moton	Assistant City Manager
Tom Tysinger	Director of Public Works
Nancy Harrington	Greenville Area Transit
Peg Gemperline	Public Transportation & Parking Commission
Robert Thompson	Pitt Area Transit Board
Phil Dickerson	Deputy County Manager, Pitt County
Todd Johnson	East Carolina University
Elvis Latiolais	Carolina Trailways
Jeff Crouchley	NCDOT/PTD
Mike Kozak	NCDOT/PTD
Ken Mayer	Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

C O M P L E T E
F A C I L I T I E S
S O L U T I O N S

Architecture

Engineering

Interior Design

Site Services

Items Discussed:

1. Ken Mayer (MMPA) opened the meeting and expressed the team's appreciation for being selected to be involved in the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) project. This first visit to Greenville will expose the team to a variety of project stakeholders and their thoughts on how this center should evolve.
2. Ken introduced Graham James whose company Martin Alexiou Bryson (MAB) prepared the feasibility study which is serving as the departure point for this next level of work. Unfortunately, another team member, Laird Pylkas of Wendel Duchscherer in Buffalo, NY had travel delays that will prevent her from attending these sessions.
3. Tom Tysinger described the process that the study would entail. Ken then elaborated by saying that the work done in this next phase will actually result in a preferred site being selected along with conceptual site and building layouts and associated budget numbers. The most optimistic projection for when this project could begin construction would be the summer of 2009.
4. Mike Kozak representing NCDOT had several comments. He noted that the FTA's contact person on this project will be Keith Milton who is a community planner in the FTA's Atlanta Regional Office. Mike noted that a key factor for the FTA in looking at what will be funded are what actual transportation functions will be housed in the facility versus what non-transportation functions are housed. A key milestone for FTA review will be when the proposed layout is shared with FTA. At that time a conference call with FTA could be held and more specific discussions about project

3 2 8 E a s t
M a r k e t S t r e e t
S u i t e 2 0 0
G r e e n s b o r o
N o r t h C a r o l i n a
2 7 4 0 1

P 336.373.9800
F 336.373.0077

www.mmpa.com



funding could occur. Mike noted that transportation projects live and die on project specific funding and that NCDOT asked various members of the NC Congressional delegation to get statewide federal funding. They encourage municipalities such as Greenville to try for their own funding as well. In 2007, Congress only funded the items that had been included in SAFETEA-LU. There was some discretionary funding available in 2007 that NCDOT had pursued. The Greenville project was not eligible at that time as a site had to be selected and a design prepared first. NCDOT's current priorities are 1) replacing buses and 2) finishing projects that have been started. If the Intermodal Center for Greenville becomes a public/private partnership, FTA will definitely need to get involved because they will certainly have their views on what is fundable.

5. Tom Tysinger noted that Greenville was funded through this phase of the project and perhaps into the next phase of more detailed design and construction documents if this first phase is successful.
6. Ken then opened the next part of the meeting which was to brainstorm what each member of the steering committee saw as their hopes, aspirations or objectives for the Intermodal project. He asked each member of the steering committee to state their top objectives for the project. As the discussion ensued, many of the items overlapped; however, here are the summary of the objectives in total:
 - a. Centerpiece project for downtown Greenville.
 - b. Extremely passenger and user friendly.
 - c. Focal point of urban development and redevelopment in downtown.
 - d. Laid out for optimum operating efficiency.
 - e. Ultimate in convenience for its customers.
 - f. An impetus for regional transportation.
 - g. Safe and secure
 - h. Excessively accessible and exceed the requirements of ADA. Accessibility should also extend to its hours of operation and ease of use.
 - i. Use of the facility and the transportation modes should be seamless.
 - j. A catalyst for economic development around it.
 - k. Adapt to future needs in transportation.
 - l. Increase the types of transit users from those that have to use transit to those who see it as a desirable way to get around.
 - m. Increase access to the University.
 - n. "A poster child for public transportation and the users should represent a melting pot of Greenville."
 - o. Transportation other than cars.
 - p. Facilitate and perhaps itself be a public/private partnership.
7. The next portion of the meeting began with the question: "What words would you use to describe the facility on the day it opens". Step One in this process was to for the committee to select the words from a fifty or so that were laid out on the table (or to add additional words). From this exercise, the group reached consensus on five basic themes and associated images for the facility. The themes are outlined below and the images are attached to this meeting summary.
 - a. Theme One – Accessibility – the theme of accessibility included words such as open, inviting, engaging and public. The idea here is that accessibility goes beyond that for

- disabled patrons but means how the facility is perceived and ultimately used by the public.
- b. Theme Two – Safety – it also includes the adjective comfortable. Perceptions of these facilities as being unsafe are fairly common when in fact because of the activity, police presence and other uses in facilities such as these they do turn out to be quite safe. Changing those perceptions in the design of this building will be important.
 - c. Theme Three – Multipurpose – other adjectives in this theme were complimentary, collaborative, and flexible. Because the facility will house multiple transportation organizations the facility will be multipurpose. However, the thinking is that multipurpose should go beyond transportation and include other uses such as food service, offices for transportation users, visitors center and other type of functions that will make it a true community facility.
 - d. Theme Four – Inspiring – other adjectives in this theme were modern and exciting. The City of Greenville in its recent public projects has taken great care to design and build buildings that have true public presences and are a cut above most other architecture in the City. Similar goals were expressed for this facility.
 - e. Theme Five – Streamlined – the underlying objective here is to make sure that the facility functions seamlessly and that users can easily interact with the transportation functions and other uses in the facility.
8. After this exercise, the Steering Committee meeting adjourned and the team moved to their next meeting.

Meeting Two – Transit Providers

Attendees:

George Harrell	ECU Campus Operations
Dave Durand	ECUSTA
Wood Davidson	ECUSTA
Jack Tawney	ECU Parking
Mike Van Derven	ECU Parking
Elvis Latiolais	Carolina Trailways
Robert Thompson	Pitt Area Transit
Rebecca Clayton	Pitt Area Transit
Jeff Crouchley	NC DOT
Charles Mayo	Pitt County Memorial Hospital
Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville
Graham James	Martin Alexiou Bryson
Ken Mayer	MMPA

Items discussed:

1. Ken opened the meeting by posing two basic questions that the design team wanted this group to respond to. He emphasized that the purpose of this meeting was not to have detailed program discussions about sizes of spaces but rather to step back and look at a larger picture of what the facility could be. The detailed programming discussions will occur on the design team's next visit.

- a. Question 1 – Since the Martin/Alexiou/Bryson Study they did March 2006 was complete and many of the discussions that led to that final report actually occurred in 2005, what changes if any have occurred in your organization that we need to take into account in this study?
- Bob Thompson, Chairman of the PATS (Pitt Area Transit Services) Board stated that PATS has changed from a private non-profit organization to being a county operation as of July 1, 2007. The county is taking on responsibility to some degree. There is now a local match of \$13 million dollars for the service. Some of PATS' objectives are: expanded services, both in terms of hours and areas of the county; collaboration with other transportation providers; integrating the PATS service with other regional services in adjacent counties so that a larger network of transportation can be developed; identifying ways to get outlying East Carolina students into town and to Campus. Bob also noted that the University has opened up its assisted technology learning laboratory to the public. This is also a draw for residents in the county.
 - Charles Mayo, representing Pitt County Memorial Hospital (PCMH) had several comments. ECU, the Hospital and the City have been working collaboratively on street closure issues so there is a better mentality on collaboration and an awareness of the need to work together. PCMH shuttles have started using public roads rather than just moving people within the hospital complex. Ridership, because of construction and other impacts, has grown from 28,000 to 51,000 people per month. It is not just staff that is using the shuttles; the public also uses it to go to the Ronald McDonald House or medical students use it to go to fast food places at lunch time. PCMH sees the ITC as a communication center that can provide a information for newcomers and visitors. Charles also pointed out that they have recently constructed an area where other transportation services can link to the PCMH shuttle service. The notion of a mini-hub or sub-center at the hospital medical center complex was noted by Tom Tysinger as something worth looking at as well. As an aside, Charles noted that he was amazed at how many people take taxis to work. Bob Thompson noted that as more people learn about PATS and the rural general public service that the service may become more utilized and certainly more economically viable than taxis.
 - George Harrell and other representatives of East Carolina noted a number of points about their system. They have just established their first transfer point at the Boady Health Sciences Center at the medical campus. They are continually dealing with both on and off campus student growth. They see the Intermodal Transportation Center as an interlink between all the systems. The hope is that the Intermodal Center will have a sophisticated traffic management system so that operators will also know which buses are coming, going and where they are to park. Bicycles are also an issue and need to be addressed in the Center. An airport connection through a shuttle service by GREAT, perhaps, from the Intermodal Center would be very beneficial to students.
 - Elvis Latiolais with Trailways stated that their needs were essentially the same as identified in the feasibility study.

- Tom Tysinger, speaking for GREAT, noted that GREAT has doubled its service since a regional transit feasibility study was completed in 2003. They plan to add more service in the Spring. Currently the City population of 72,000 includes 18,000 to 20,000 students at East Carolina so the population and usage of the GREAT system fluctuates significantly when students are in or out of town. Tom noted that he is seeing a philosophy change politically in the City and a willingness to spend more money on transit. GREAT looks to the Intermodal Center as a way to hopefully avoid duplication and to find ways for the GREAT and East Carolina systems to integrate and better serve the entire population.
- b. Question Two – What would the Intermodal Center do for you?
 - East Carolina's representatives focused on the ITC being a link between systems so that, for example, someone working on campus could commute on a GREAT bus to the ITC then catch a campus bus to their workplace. ECU representatives also noted that there are 600 vacant parking spaces every day on campus which growth will rapidly fill up. The ECU Student Transit System carries over two million riders per year. ECU is hoping that the ITC will make people think of changing how they look at transportation. They also noted that the ITC should have low connection times so that waits are short and the right systems are in place to get the most used connections. The Intermodal Center has to be convenient and has to match the convenience of a car.
 - Charles Mayo of PCMH noted that people who are staying in facilities such as Hope Lodge or Ronald McDonald House because family members have long term hospital issues need transportation around the city. These are people who, in his words, can really be lost in terms of getting around.
 - Tom Tysinger noted that the city currently has a Convention & Visitors Bureau located at the Convention Center and that they are interested in going back downtown. The possibility of a Visitors Center that might even include East Carolina at the transportation center would be an idea.
 - Ken described the projects underway in Greensboro where a Visitors Center is being developed in the Transportation Center and the idea is to have electronic nodes of information throughout the city that all link to a single database. A person arriving at the airport, the Transportation Center or the Convention Center could all access similar information about what's going on in Greensboro.
 - Ken also noted that the Greensboro Depot, as large as it is, did not have a critical mass of users for car rental and wondered if people were familiar with the Zip Car or Flex Car concepts where you use credit cards to access and rent vehicles for short periods of time.
 - Ken asked the question of each of the providers also what role would commuter rail potentially play. The East Carolina representatives noted that they get calls at the start or end of the semester on "how do I get home"? Rail could be one solution to that. They noted that at one time they had an East Carolina RDU shuttle but it did not last because of the different times that people needed to go catch flights. Tom noted that if a commuter rail was extended from Raleigh to Greenville and those times were competitive to a car he believes there would be a number of daily commuters to Raleigh from Greenville.

This meeting adjourned and the design team prepared for its next meeting.

Meeting Three – Uptown Greenville

Attendees:

Myriah Shewchuic	Uptown/Rivers & Associates
Yaprak Savut	Uptown / ECU
Carl Rees	City of Greenville Redevelopment Commission
Denise Walsh	Uptown Greenville
Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville
Graham James	MAB
Ken Mayer	MMPA

Items discussed:

1. The basic purpose of this meeting was to look at how the downtown community viewed the Intermodal Center: whether it was a positive or negative; and how it could impact the future of downtown. Each of the representatives felt that the center would be a positive critical mass project for downtown redevelopment.
 - Denise Walsh, the Director of Uptown Greenville, offered that some people had expressed concerns about bus stops attracting homeless people. But, beyond that she had heard no serious concerns with the Intermodal Center idea.
 - Yaprak Savut noted that transportation is becoming extremely important as sustainability issues gain in importance in Greenville and elsewhere.
 - Carl Rees had several comments. First, the Redevelopment Commission has added supporting the ITC to their annual workplan. Second, south of Reade Circle several developers have begun assembling land for large multiuse projects. East Carolina has also been assembling land east of Reade Circle. As these projects evolve, they will further add to the need for the Transportation Center but they are also potentially taking land that might be a good site for the Transportation Center. Third, the scale of these new developments range from single buildings to ten to fifteen acre projects. Fourth, the Performing Arts Center that is shown on the redevelopment plan is an East Carolina project and has recently come from nowhere to be their fifth highest priority project. While this means it is still several years away, the fact that it is now a high priority means it will begin to gain some momentum. It is still planned to go downtown but it could be anywhere downtown not just at the site shown on the redevelopment plan. Pitt County apparently is also looking at moving its offices to downtown from a suburban location and if so, they would be in the northern area near the courthouse. Carl also noted that the downtown school that is shown on the redevelopment plan is no longer being considered and a downtown campus for the Community College will also not be in the scene of the future.
 - Myriah Shewchuk noted that the Intermodal Center will be good if it compliments and does not take away from uptown businesses and develops another node of activity in downtown. Right now the intersection of Fifth and Evans is the main activity node downtown with the county courthouse complex being a second node to the north. Walkability is the key. These

nodes give people a reason and the opportunity to walk a bit further and if the ITC is about more than just transportation people will consider walking there.

- Carl then noted that location should prioritize the primary function. If the main function is redevelopment locate the facility as close as possible to Reade Circle. If the main function is transportation move it closer to Tenth St.
 - Yaprak stated that walkability depends on the site. A nicer walk feels shorter and people will find themselves in the middle of downtown suddenly. People need distractions on the walk.
 - Tom Tysinger noted that when Evans St. was a mall, the GREAT transfer point was at Fourth and Evans. Once the mall was removed, uptown businesses did not want the transfer center at that location so it was moved temporarily to the east side of downtown along Reade Circle. It works well at that location operationally but there are no facilities for the users.
 - Tom asked if the downtown representatives saw any problems in the business association. Denise noted that traffic impact could be an issue. Myriah mentioned the backlash of perception from one portion of the community but as the hospital and East Carolina are attracting people to town that come from areas where they are used to taking the bus, there is a growing group who will see the ITC as a good thing and who will want more availability of buses as well. Yaprak noted that the ITC would help include older mobility impaired people in the downtown and the broader community. Carl noted that the UNX Chemical Facility which is in an ideal location for the transportation center is an issue in downtown and that they have been working with the company to find an alternative location.
2. Ken raised the question “is there any opportunity to bundle the Intermodal Transportation Center with the developments being talked about along Reade Circle”? Carl said that at this point that has not been discussed but since they are in conversation with both the developers considering projects that could certainly be brought up. The development proposed west of Evans St. will be primarily commercial and condominiums while east of Evans St. it will be upscale student housing. Ken noted that in other communities the transportation center has been bundled with a development project which provides benefits to both the developer and the city.
 3. Myriah noted that the streetscape guidelines workshop recently conducted found Fifth and Evans to be the center of downtown. People generally stick with the block between Fifth and Fourth and businesses north of Fourth don’t do nearly as well as the other blocks to the south. She then raised the question “could the ITC anchor the north end of downtown?” Tom Tysinger commented that while it could certainly be located there it would lose one of its goals of being close to the University.
 4. Other discussions of potential sites were held. Carl noted that the site where there is a BB& T would be a viable location but BB & T is not interested in moving.
 5. Other Comments:
 - a. A Visitors Center in the Intermodal Center would be an excellent idea and Carl feels that the CVB would be open to that discussion.
 - b. The redevelopment plan shows a potential downtown hotel and alumni center and while the University is not interested in being the driving force behind that, they are interested in bringing a private hotel developer in to look at that opportunity.
 - c. Carl noted that architecture will be important, and the building needs to be inspiring.

- d. Myriah noted that security will be critical as will the center's relationship with the streetscape. Some semi-public space outside of the building will be essential.
- e. Carl noted that the final design for a new streetscape on Cotanche St. between Reade and Fifth is nearing completion.
- f. It was noted that as the health care industry grows in Greenville so does the number of assisted living communities. Those are the potential riders for the bus system.

This meeting adjourned and the design team prepared for the evening public meeting.

Meeting Four – Open Public Meeting

Attendees:

Approximately eighteen people, ten of whom were general public, were in attendance.

General Comments on the center were:

- a. Make it look nice.
- b. Make it a place where people can go and eat and have a place to sit and rest.
- c. Police substation is a good idea.
- d. Being near railroad would entice rail service.
- e. Be accessible.
- f. AAA travel ought to have a center in Greenville perhaps in the ITC.
- g. Have a full cover over the bus loading areas. Winston-Salem is a good example of a full cover and it is opposite of a concert venue so there is activity in the evening.
- h. The 30th Street facility in Philadelphia is also a good comparison where there is no strong delineation between waiting space and commercial space. It all flows together.
- i. Question – what would address security? Response: Design, police presence, lighting.
- j. Building design should feel open.
- k. Make it a hub of activity beyond transportation needs.
- l. Possibly include a Visitor Center/Museum
- m. A place where you walk for lunch.
- n. Secure parking.
- o. No big trees that people can hide behind.
- 1. Ken posed the question “how do you change the culture to get people to use more transportation”?
 - a. Give free tickets for a few days.
 - b. Be a dependable service.
 - c. Do what you said you would do.
- 2. Other Comments:
 - a. Elvis Latiolais noted that this facility would be a good opportunity for through-ticketing connections. For example, a rider could purchase a ticket from a rural community that would already be a through-ticket to connect to Trailways to go to another location.
 - b. There was some discussion about public art and Tom Tysinger noted that City Hall has an agreement with the Museum of Art to supply art for City Hall and that could certainly be looked at for the ITC.

- c. Thom Moton noted that he supported the airport connection particularly with the increasing number of international students coming to the University.
- d. Tom Tysinger noted that the bike racks on buses are often full which gives a sense of the growth of the bicycle culture in Greenville.

This concluded the public meeting and the meetings on July 16th.

July 17th meetings:

Meeting Five – City Administration

Attendees:

Tom Wisemiller	Community Development, City of Greenville
Dave Holec	City Attorney
Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville
Wayne Bowers	City Manager
Andrew Schmidt	CVB
Thomas Moton	City of Greenville
Graham James	MAB
Ken Mayer	MMPA

Items discussed:

This meeting focuses on the general objectives from the City Administration for the facility as well as discussion of some specific sites.

1. Andrew Schmidt with the CVB noted that an airport connector would be useful. He often gets calls from visitors because cabs don't meet their flights as one of their priorities. Hotels cannot really justify a staff member on call for a shuttle for just six flights a day but he felt the city could justify a shuttle to the ITC for an airport connection.
2. Ken raised the question again about bundling the ITC and other projects. Discussion ensued about the two larger projects currently being proposed, one on the east side and one on the west side of Evans St. at Reade Circle. Developers are having difficulty assembling all the pieces. Hams, for example, does not want to sell its site and without all the parcels, the east site for example, becomes fairly tight to accomplish the developer's intent much less include the ITC.
3. Other sites were looked at and their pros and cons were discussed. The general conclusion was that sites just south of Reade Circle but to the east of Evans would be preferred with crossing Evans to the west being a second set of choices. There is an abandoned church, for example, on 8th Street that is adjacent to the chemical plant could be a potential site with the proper land assemblage. It was agreed that as you got closer to Dickinson, the desirability of sites became less. At one time, Tenth St. was seen as a key element of the ITC's location because of the upcoming Tenth St. connector project being a primary shuttle route back and forth between the University and the medical center complex. It appears, however, that a site a couple blocks off

Tenth St. would still provide easy access for the shuttles to connect the ITC to the medical center and to the campus.

4. There was some discussion about providing showers and lockers at the ITC to encourage bike riding and provide bike riders with a place to shower before catching a bus to their place of work. This has a number of operational issues and security issues that would need to be considered.

This meeting adjourned and the design team prepared for the next meeting.

Meeting Six – Police Department

Attendees:

Janice E. Harris	ECU
William J. Anderson	City – PD
Joe Bartlett	City – PD
Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville
Graham James	MAB
Ken Mayer	MMPA

1. Ken posed the question to each of the representatives about whether putting a police sub-station in the facility would be an advantage and what would the requirements be?
2. Chief Anderson had a number of comments:
 - a. A sub-station would be a plus as homeless people gathering is often a problem at facilities like this.
 - b. They currently have no specific downtown patrol but they are considering a downtown foot patrol in the future that could be based in the ITC. They could also have a bike patrol based here and would thus need storage for bikes and other support functions. He believes this will provide visibility and would aim for the sub-station to be in constant use. He would like to have a civilian receptionist as well during daytime hours and this person could actually double as a visitors center receptionist.
 - c. A joint sub-station with East Carolina would be desirable and would encourage the University to be more involved. ECU and Greenville have joint jurisdiction in this area and the ECU police have on-campus space issues that this could help solve.
 - d. The Police Department is currently trying to put cameras downtown. The University already has cameras that are monitored by both police departments.
 - e. The Evans/Reade area previously discussed would be a perfect location for a substation.
 - f. The City Manager has been considering using an empty storefront as a sub-station which would be good in the short term but in the long term the ITC would be a better location.
 - g. Showers would require police presence. User fees may also be appropriate.
3. Janice Harris, the acting Chief at East Carolina had several comments:
 - a. People often get off the bus at the Trailways Depot in its current location but do not know where to go and there is no way to connect to other parts in the city. These people often end up at the Police Department to make phone calls for people to come pick them up.

- b. A joint sub-station would be no problem. The East Carolina Police will be involved in the new student recreation field across the river and that will need a joint effort with the City. There are similar joint efforts at the medical center so one for the ITC would not be a problem.
- c. The University has plenty of bicycle trained officers but not enough space to store the bikes so this is another opportunity for a joint use.

This meeting adjourned and the design team prepared for the next meeting.

Meeting Seven – Public Transportation and Parking Commission

Attendees:	Peg Gemperline	Chairperson of the Commission
	Bob Thompson	Steering Committee
	Daniel Spaller	East Carolina University Representative
	Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville
	Graham James	MAB
	Ken Mayer	MMPA

Ken gave the group an update on what had occurred over the two days of meetings. Peg and Bob are both members of the Steering Committee and Bob had been involved in a number of the meetings to-date.

Comments from this meeting include:

1. Bob Thompson asked what the Commission could do to change the culture and get students to understand that riding city buses is safe. He referred to the new program in Greensboro called HEAT (Higher Education Area Transit) that connects colleges and universities with downtown and other locations. He also queried as to how citizens who would potentially use the buses could change their perceptions of the students as being simply a bunch of revelers catching a ride home from a night out.
2. Tom Tysinger noted that the downtown area late at night has a much different and safer feel in the past few months as the police from both East Carolina and the City are providing foot patrols which has reduce the number of incidents.
3. Peg noted that the downtown bars make people going home under the influence easy targets for crime.
4. Daniel stated that downtown bars are a draw for students. You can go to the bars without a car and walk back to your place of residence. He also noted that there is an extensive amount of crime in the student suburban apartment complexes.
5. Tom noted that the chemical plant will move eventually but not in the near future so that might be a difficult site for the facility.
6. Some discussion occurred around the question Ken posed about any future parking deck needs. The city apparently has money in capital reserves for a deck but it is not needed today. However, if a developer came in and needed parking to make a deal work, the city could be in a position to provide it. The only deck in Greenville is at the hospital. The University does not have any decks.

7. Daniel noted that students are receptive to interaction with the community. They see East Carolina as big University with a small town feel which is a great attraction for students coming to the University. He feels that the students and the police have a much better relationship.

This meeting adjourned and the design team prepared for the next meeting.

Meeting Eight – Steering Committee Wrap Up Session

Attendees: **Original Steering Committee minus Nancy Harrington and Bob Thompson.**

Ken gave an overview of what he felt had been learned from all of the sessions over the two day period. Four major themes emerged from the discussions:

1. *Safety and security.* Negative perceptions about safety and security at the transportation center in downtown itself have to be overcome. Both ECU and City police are willing to work together with a joint sub-station and downtown foot/bike patrols. They will also need to look at security issues around long term parking; for example, people who may have parked at the ITC, caught a shuttle to the airport and left town for several days.
2. *Change.* Its happening and the relationships of the different transportation providers will strengthen as a result of the ITC will help. The ITC will require a change in culture, a change in how the systems will operate and integrate with each other and change in town and gown relationships.
3. *The location of the center is shifting.* In the previous study it had been seen as closer to Tenth St. and further west towards Dickinson. However, the preferred location is moving and narrowing towards the area southeast and southwest of Reade and Evans. It is felt that a maximum one to two block walk to the center city and East Carolina campus is ideal.
4. *Multiple uses are seen as a key for the success of this facility.* A mix of transportation and non-transportation uses is desired (but the non-transportation uses will need other funding). A Visitors Center idea has been well received and an airport shuttle has been mentioned quite a bit. There is potential for conversations involving public/private partnerships because of several private projects being discussed now. There are two possible paths for the ITC to take: it can be transportation center with a few related ancillary functions or a transportation center within a much larger project.

Other ensuing comments included:

1. Mike Kozak noted that the police functions assigned to the transit center will qualify for federal funding. He stated that the current federal focus on transit security outside the big cities is a big help. Greensboro, for example, did well for federal funding. Because few areas counted as non-transportation, most of the facility qualified for FTA funding.
2. Ken raised the question “could ECU transit staff be based at the ITC”. While this would certainly be something to explore, the cost of developing its space would not be eligible for federal funds if the student transit service remains closed door, i.e. allowing only student ridership. It was noted that the system actually does allow the public to ride but it is just not advertised. It would have to be advertised as public for federal funding to come into play.
3. Thom Moton noted that students do request an airport shuttle and while that was tried at one time, there was not enough demand.

4. Tom Tysinger noted that the schedule for the Tenth St. connector project will be 2011 to 2012 at the earliest.
5. There was discussion about a possible rail connection at a Reade/Evans or Eighth St. site. Graham James sketched an overlay that showed how a new north/south track could be extended to the site in this area and how the length of platforms could be accommodated. It was noted that the distance from the rail is not very great and would not require a shuttle from the sites being considered.
6. Tom Tysinger noted that the partnerships being discussed could either be public/private or they could even be public/public. Tom noted that there is a really good record of cooperation between the city, the hospital and East Carolina. They have partnered on highway projects in the past and he the same partnerships involved with this project.
7. Mike Kosak noted that on projects that are not historic buildings flexibility is the key. A site might be identified but a downtown opportunity might end up displacing that site. He cited Wilmington as an example where a new downtown headquarters was placed on a site that had been identified for Wilmington's ITC.
8. There was a great deal of discussion on how to involve students in the planning process. There was a general agreement to have a student representative join the Steering Committee and also that if there is a student advisory group for transit they should be involved in meetings on the next design team visit.
9. Todd Johnson raised a question about maintenance and Tom Tysinger noted that the bus maintenance would not be at the ITC.

Homework assignments: Several homework assignments were given out as follows:

1. Todd Johnson – liaise with the East Carolina reps who attended the transit providers meeting and aim for consensus within the ECU community.
2. Phil Dickerson – contact other counties regarding their needs for the ITC.
3. City of Greenville – talk to private developers to see who might be interested in bundling this project.
4. Thom Moton and Tom Tysinger – consider how to get the Redevelopment Commission involved.
5. Peg Gemperline – need to hear from the Public Transportation and Parking Commission. See if there are other issues that didn't come up this morning.
6. Mike Kozak – liaise with real Division of FTA to clarify review processes.

Ken noted that design team's next visit will involve technical discussions about what will be required in the facility. The people involved from each transportation provider need to be able to address those issues. In addition, there will need to be forums or other ways for the GREAT users and ECU transit users to provide their input.

This meeting adjourned.

Please notify the writer of any changes to this summary.

Summary prepared by: Kenneth C. Mayer, Jr., AIA, LEED AP
 Moser Mayer Phoenix Associates

Graham James, CMILT
Martin Alexiou Bryson

C: All Attendees